

**LENINISM
AND
MODERN REVISIONISM**



FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING

**LENINISM
AND
MODERN REVISIONISM**

"Hongqi" Editorial, No. 1, 1963

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING 1963

Leninism, the fundamental revolutionary principles of Marxism expounded by the great Lenin, which represents a new stage in the development of Marxism, is being assailed, distorted and adulterated by the modern revisionists more viciously than ever before.

The essential thing about Leninism is the fact that it has carried the teachings of Marx and Engels further, providing a scientific analysis of capitalism's sharpening contradictions in its development to the stage of imperialism, and further enriching the Marxist theory and tactics on proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship. The Great October Revolution achieved victory under the direct leadership of Lenin. Carrying on the cause of the October Revolution, the Chinese people and the people of many other countries have also won a series of victories. These are victories for Marxism, victories for Leninism.

Lenin once said that "this doctrine [of Marx] had to fight at every step in its course".¹ Similarly, Leninism developed in the course of struggle against the revisionism of the Second International. Every new confirmation and victory of Leninism has unavoidably been accompanied by "one battle after another against political stupidity, vulgarity, opportunism, etc."²

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Marxism and Revisionism", *Selected Works*, in two volumes, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1950, Vol. I, Part 1, p. 87.

² V. I. Lenin, "Letter to Inessa Armand", *Against Revisionism*, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1959, p. 351.

The old-line revisionists of the Second International often used what they called "new data on economic development" to confuse the masses and cut the revolutionary soul out of Marxism, and yet they falsely displayed the colours of "Marxism". History is repeating itself under different circumstances and in different forms. The modern revisionists, falsely displaying the colours of "Leninism" and talking glibly about being "faithful to Lenin", are actually repeating the same process of using certain "new data" on historical development to confuse people, undermine the revolutionary teachings of Leninism and assail the essentials of Leninism, i.e., Lenin's teachings on imperialism and his theory and tactics on proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship.

Like the revisionism-opportunism of the Second International, modern revisionism is trying hard to cover up the contradictions of capitalism and imperialism and to deny that imperialism is moribund, decaying capitalism whose days are numbered. It has gone so far as to describe modern imperialism as "peaceful" and "democratic" "supra-imperialism". The modern revisionists represented by the Tito group of Yugoslavia have especially tried to make the imperialist monopoly-capitalist state machine look attractive. They describe the so-called policy of nationalization, state-monopoly capitalism and state economic intervention in the imperialist countries and capitalist countries in general in such terms as "the growth of socialist factors", "the realization of planned economy", "the beginning of the process of socialist transformation", and so on. They prate about "gradual change", "the integration of revolution and reform", "entering deeply into the socialist era", and so on. But they never have a single word to say

about the need, in the transition from capitalism to socialism, to make a revolution that will smash the bourgeois state machine and to replace bourgeois dictatorship with proletarian dictatorship. It is well known that the fundamental Marxist standpoint which Lenin took great pains to expound was precisely that of the revolution to smash the bourgeois state machine and the replacement of bourgeois dictatorship by proletarian dictatorship. For without such a revolution, all talk about socialist transformation will be meaningless, and state-monopoly capitalism will remain capitalism and nothing else. Lenin had well said that the existence and growth of monopoly capitalism, including state-monopoly capitalism, can only demonstrate the maturing of the material prerequisites for socialism and the impending approach and inevitability of the socialist revolution, but cannot in any way serve "as an argument in favour of tolerating the repudiation of such a revolution and the efforts to make capitalism look more attractive, an occupation in which all the reformists are engaged".¹

Herein lies a fundamental difference in the appraisal of our epoch. When Marxist-Leninists say that "the main content of our epoch is the transition from capitalism to socialism which was begun by the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia",² they base themselves on the viewpoint of proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship, and on the fundamental experience of the

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The State and Revolution", *Selected Works*, in two volumes, Moscow, 1952, Vol. II, Part 1, p. 270.

² Declaration of the Meeting of Representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the Socialist Countries, held in Moscow, November 14 to 16, 1957.

Great October Socialist Revolution. But the modern revisionists, shunning this viewpoint like the plague, distort the experience of the October Revolution and avoid referring to the road of the October Revolution as the common road leading to the emancipation of mankind. As a matter of fact, they regard our epoch as one of "capitalism growing into socialism peacefully".

Marxism-Leninism has always attached importance to the struggle for democracy. In countries where the bourgeois-democratic revolution has not yet been accomplished, the proletariat must mobilize the masses, make every effort to lead the bourgeois-democratic revolution and fight for its victory. In countries where bourgeois democracy exists, the proletariat should utilize the democratic rights already won to fight for more democratic rights in order to educate, arouse and organize the masses to fight the bourgeois system of exploitation and violence. After the seizure of power, the proletariat should solidify and strengthen the dictatorship of the proletariat and at the same time give effect to widespread democracy under highly centralized guidance. In other words, it must enforce dictatorship over the enemy and practise people's democracy within the ranks of the people in order to ensure the successful building of socialism and communism. Democracy invariably has a class character. Marxist-Leninists have always treated the problem of democracy in its historical context and have never talked about "democracy in the abstract" or "democracy in general".

Lenin emphasized that under capitalism, the proletariat can retain its independence only if it makes its struggle for democracy serve its over-all objective

of proletarian dictatorship.¹ He went on to point out that the replacement of bourgeois dictatorship by proletarian dictatorship means an extension of democracy which is of world-wide historic significance; it means a change from bogus democracy to genuine democracy; and it means to deprive the exploiting few of democratic rights and enable the working people, the overwhelming majority, to enjoy democracy. To think that the dictatorship of the proletariat implies the rejection of democracy is a degenerate "liberal and false assertion" which loses sight of the class struggle.² Like the old-line revisionists, the modern revisionists use every kind of pretext to obliterate the class character of democracy and the difference between bourgeois and proletarian democracy. In championing "democracy in general" or "democracy of the whole people", they are actually making a fetish of bourgeois democracy, i.e., of bourgeois dictatorship. Proceeding from this viewpoint, they do their utmost to confound revolution with reform and to limit and confine all their work to the scope permitted by bourgeois dictatorship. Lenin long ago repudiated this extremely wrong point of view. He said:

It would be sheer nonsense to think that the most profound revolution in human history — one which for the first time transferred power from the exploiting minority to the exploited majority — could be performed within the old framework of bourgeois, par-

¹ Cf. V. I. Lenin, "The Socialist Revolution and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination", *Selected Works*, International Publishers, New York, 1943, Vol. V, p. 273.

² Cf. V. I. Lenin, "The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky", *Selected Works*, in two volumes, Moscow, Vol. II, Part 2, pp. 40, 48-57.

liamentary democracy, without drastic changes, without the creation of new forms of democracy and new institutions conforming to the new conditions for applying democracy, etc.¹

This proposition of Lenin's has proved correct in relation to the October Revolution and also completely correct in relation to the victories subsequently won by a number of countries in their socialist revolution. Yet what the modern revisionists persist in is exactly the absurd theory Lenin had refuted. Under socialism, the modern revisionists, again on the pretext of "democracy in general", deny the class character of democracy and strive to achieve their objective of gradually eliminating the dictatorship of the proletariat in order to facilitate the gradual restoration of capitalism in a certain form.

On the question of the fight for world peace and peaceful coexistence, too, the modern revisionists have vulgarized Leninism in the extreme and have completely adulterated it.

Ever since the first socialist state in the world made its appearance, all Marxist-Leninists, from Lenin onward, have considered it a major task for socialist countries to work for peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems and to oppose the imperialist policies of aggression and war. The Communist Party of China headed by Comrade Mao Tse-tung has always held that disputes between nations should be settled by peaceful means and not by force. This Chinese Communist Party view is not only constantly reiterated in our

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Theses on Bourgeois Democracy and Proletarian Dictatorship Presented to the First Congress of the Communist International", *Against Revisionism*, Moscow, p. 494.

statements but is firmly expressed in our policies and actions. All the world knows that the People's Republic of China was an initiator of the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence and has steadfastly put them into practice. All the attempts of the imperialists, reactionaries and modern revisionists to obliterate these facts are vain.

Of course, the policy of peace pursued by the socialist countries has not nullified the various contradictions objectively existing in the world, namely, the contradiction between the socialist and the imperialist countries, the contradiction between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat in the capitalist countries, the contradiction between imperialism and the oppressed nations, the contradictions between the imperialist powers and the contradictions between the various monopoly groups inside each imperialist country. Marxist-Leninists take the view that, whether in the past, present or future, there can be no ignoring or covering up of these contradictions, as such political philistines as the modern revisionists are trying to do, if world peace is to be secured and peaceful coexistence between the socialist countries and countries with different social systems is to be achieved. Marxist-Leninists, including the Chinese Communists, have always held that peaceful coexistence between the socialist countries and countries with different social systems can be attained, and that the world war which the imperialists are seeking to kindle can be prevented, provided the socialist countries persist in their policy of peace, provided the people's revolutionary forces in various countries and all the peace-loving countries and people of the world unite in resolute and effective struggle against the imperialist forces of aggression and war, manacle the imperialists in various ways and narrow down their sphere of opera-

tion. At the same time, Marxist-Leninists have consistently held that the strivings for peaceful coexistence between the socialist countries and countries with different social systems on the one hand, and the class struggle within the capitalist countries and the revolutionary anti-imperialist struggles of the oppressed nations on the other, are two different matters and two different kinds of problem, and that the former cannot substitute or negate the latter: The struggle waged by the oppressed people in the capitalist countries and the struggle of the oppressed nations are helpful to the strivings for world peace and for peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems. The attempt of the modern revisionists to restrict, weaken and even negate the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed people and oppressed nations by hypocritical appeals for "peace" and "peaceful coexistence" is in complete accord with the wishes of the imperialists and the reactionaries of various countries and is most damaging to the struggle for peace and for peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems.

Just as the old-line revisionists attacked Marxism under the pretext of opposing dogmatism, so the modern revisionists use the same pretext to attack Leninism. As far back as the beginning of the 20th century, Lenin wrote that the reformists and revisionists in the working-class movement in various countries "all belong to the same family, all extol each other, learn from each other, and together come out against 'dogmatic' Marxism".¹ Has not the picture which Lenin drew sixty years ago re-

¹ V. I. Lenin, "What Is to Be Done?" *Selected Works*, in two volumes, Moscow, Vol. I, Part 1, p. 208.

appeared today in new historical conditions? The only difference is that the modern revisionists are more unscrupulous in their attacks on Marxism-Leninism. For example, some persons indulging in sheer fabrication say that the "dogmatists" want "to demonstrate the superiority of socialism and communism over capitalism by means of war". What is this but a most absurd slander levelled at Marxist-Leninists and a contemptible attempt to curry favour with imperialism and the reactionaries of various countries?

Moreover, the modern revisionists give voice to pure inventions such as that the revolutionary Marxist-Leninists, whom they label "dogmatists", "reject" certain necessary compromises. We would like to tell these modern revisionists that no serious-minded Marxist-Leninist rejects all compromises indiscriminately. In the course of our protracted revolutionary struggle, we Chinese Communists reached compromises on many occasions with our enemies, internal and external. For example, we came to a compromise with the reactionary Chiang Kai-shek clique. We also came to a compromise with the U.S. imperialists, in the struggle to aid Korea and resist U.S. aggression. For Marxist-Leninists, the question is what kind of a compromise to arrive at, the nature of the compromise, and how to bring it about. Lenin rightly said that "to reject compromises 'on principle', to reject the admissibility of compromises in general, no matter of what kind, is childishness, which it is difficult even to take seriously."¹ As Lenin also told us, a political leader who de-

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Left-Wing Communism, An Infantile Disorder", *Selected Works*, in two volumes, Moscow, Vol. II, Part 2, p. 359.

sires to be useful to the revolutionary proletariat must know how to distinguish compromises that are permissible and in the interests of the people's cause from those compromises that are impermissible and are an expression of treachery. It is precisely in accordance with Lenin's teachings that we Chinese Communists distinguish between different kinds of compromise, favouring compromises which are in the interests of the people's cause and of world peace, and opposing compromises that are in the nature of treachery. It is perfectly clear that only those guilty now of adventurism, now of capitulationism, are the ones whose ideology is Trotskyism, or Trotskyism in a new guise.

In April 1946, Comrade Mao Tse-tung wrote in his article "Some Points in Appraisal of the Present International Situation" that it was possible for the socialist countries to reach agreement with the imperialist countries through peaceful negotiation and make necessary compromise on some issues, including certain important ones. Comrade Mao Tse-tung holds that "such compromise . . . can be the outcome only of resolute, effective struggles by all the democratic forces of the world against the reactionary forces of the United States, Britain and France". He then adds, "Such compromise does not require the people in the countries of the capitalist world to follow suit and make compromises at home. The people in those countries will continue to wage different struggles in accordance with their different conditions."¹ This analysis advanced by Comrade Mao Tse-tung is scientific; it is a Marxist and Leninist analysis. The

¹ Mao Tse-tung, *Selected Works*, Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1961, Vol. IV, p. 87.

Chinese Communist policy in relation to international affairs has all along been formulated according to this proposition of Comrade Mao Tse-tung's.

However, the imperialists, the reactionaries of various countries and the modern revisionists always attempt to hurt us through every kind of slander. We should be aware that there has never been a revolutionary party in history which was not vilified by the enemy and his agents. The great Bolsheviks were subjected to countless enemy calumnies. "They fulminated against the Bolsheviks who were consistently described as 'sectarians, dogmatists, Blanquists, anarchists, etc.'"¹ All the revolutionary Marxist-Leninists in the world are now being subjected to attacks by the modern revisionists, and it is a matter for deep regret that Comrade Togliatti should have joined in such attacks.

The modern revisionists have made many charges against the Chinese Communist Party. Why? Is it not because we resolutely defend the purity of Marxism-Leninism? Is it not because we categorically refuse to bargain over principles and categorically refuse to make concessions as regards theory? Is it not because we stand firm against both modern revisionism and dogmatism, against both Right and "Left" opportunism, against both capitulationism and adventurism, against both unprincipled accommodation and sectarianism which alienates one from the masses, and against both great-power chauvinism and the various kinds of reactionary nationalism?

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Tactics of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party During the Election Campaign", *Collected Works*, 4th Russian ed., State Publishing House of Political Literature, Moscow, Vol. XII, p. 123.

Some people go to great lengths to attack, at every available opportunity and with shameless misrepresentation, the thesis of the Chinese Communist Party that "imperialism and all reactionaries are paper tigers". This thesis is derived from Lenin's scientific proposition that imperialism is moribund and decaying capitalism, from the many years of China's revolutionary experience and from the whole of the revolutionary experience in history. This thesis is in full accord with Lenin's description of imperialism as a "colossus with feet of clay", as a "bugbear", as an "enemy who appears so strong" and as "capitalist beasts . . . absolutely incapable of doing us any harm". These people constantly boast about acting in accord with Lenin's principles. But in fact they invariably deviate from them and from the essence of Leninism, that is, from Lenin's teachings on imperialism, on proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship. On the question of how to appraise the nature of imperialism do they not clearly reveal themselves to be far removed from Leninism? In the final analysis, those who wildly attack the thesis that "imperialism and all reactionaries are paper tigers" are merely chiming in with imperialism, assiduously spreading the idea among peoples who desire revolution that the imperialist forces of aggression must not be resisted, that the imperialist system cannot be overthrown, and that revolution of any kind is undesirable and hopeless.

For many years U.S. imperialism and its partners have been using nuclear blackmail against the people of the world: "whoever defies our domination will be destroyed". All the demagogic propaganda which the modern revisionists represented by the Tito group have been conducting among the masses on the subject of nuclear

weapons is entirely in tune with U.S. imperialism's nuclear blackmail. All genuine Marxist-Leninists, including the Chinese Communists, consistently and resolutely oppose the imperialist policy of nuclear war and stand firmly for the banning and scrapping of nuclear weapons. The Government of the People's Republic of China has repeatedly proposed that a zone free of atomic weapons be established in the Asian and Pacific region embracing all the countries there, including the United States. All genuine Marxist-Leninists, including the Chinese Communists, always maintain that the people of all countries must grasp their destiny in their own hands and not be cowed by the U.S. imperialist policy of nuclear blackmail. At the same time, they maintain that the socialist countries should rely on the just strength of the people and their own just policies and should in no wise engage in nuclear gambles in the international arena. The modern revisionists are obviously well aware of these correct views of the Marxist-Leninists. However, they deliberately lie to deceive the masses, alleging that the "dogmatists" hope to "push mankind to the brink of nuclear war". The modern revisionists often talk about "morality". But where is their "morality" when they tell such lies? Have they not completely lost hold of the ordinary morality of human conduct?

To distort and attack the theses and the standpoint of the genuine Marxist-Leninists, the modern revisionists have spread a series of deliberate lies for the purpose of preventing the oppressed people and oppressed nations from rising in revolution and fighting for their emancipation. In the eyes of the modern revisionists, any revolution and any action supporting revolution runs counter to the "logic of survival", now that nuclear weapons

and similar military techniques exist. In fact, what they call the "logic of survival" is the logic of slaves, a logic that would paralyse the revolutionary will of the people of all countries, bind them up hand and foot and make them the submissive slaves of imperialism and of the reactionaries of various countries. The Marxist-Leninists are firmly against this slave logic and maintain that the people should emancipate themselves and build a happy, new life as their own masters. This is an irresistible law of social development.

The modern revisionists believe that, under the present historical conditions, it will be good enough just to muddle along. So what point is there in differentiating classes, differentiating the proletariat from the bourgeoisie, imperialism from the oppressed nations, capitalism from socialism, just wars from unjust wars, and revolution from counter-revolution? To them, all these differentiations have lost their significance for the present "epoch" and are "dogmatic". In short, they have actually thrown all the teachings of Marxism and Leninism to the winds. At the same time, they insist that whoever does not agree with their viewpoint and practice and does not speak and act in response to their baton is "violating" Marxism-Leninism, "denying" the creativeness of Marxism-Leninism, "attacking" the policy of peaceful coexistence, and is a "pseudo-revolutionary", a "Left adventurer", a "dogmatist", a "sectarian", a "nationalist", and so on and so forth.

Lenin denounced the revisionist-opportunists of the Second International, saying that "this extra-class or supra-class presentation, which supposedly embraces the entire people, is an outright travesty of the very founda-

tion of socialism, namely, its theory of class struggle".¹ This presentation is still more conspicuous in the preachings and policies of the modern revisionists. They deny that the masses of the people are the motive force and the creators of history. They hold that changes in the international situation and the destiny of mankind are dictated by the "leading personalities" of a few great powers, dictated by their good sense or lack of it, and are not determined by the combined strength and united struggle of the people throughout the world. Some persons have even set their hearts on being in the same boat with the leading personalities of the imperialist countries, which they regard as "the greatest honour", but do not want to be in the same boat with the masses of the world. Is it not strange that such persons should have appeared in the ranks of Marxist-Leninists?

Lenin said:

Lack of faith in the masses, fear of their initiative, fear of their independence, trepidation before their revolutionary energy instead of thorough and unstinted support of it—this is where the S.R.'s and Menshevik leaders have sinned most.²

This is the very sin of the modern revisionists.

Lenin said:

To determine its conduct from case to case, to adapt itself to the events of the day and to the chops and

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Theses on Bourgeois Democracy and Proletarian Dictatorship Presented to the First Congress of the Communist International", *Against Revisionism*, Moscow, p. 487.

² V. I. Lenin, "One of the Fundamental Questions of the Revolution", *Collected Works*, International Publishers, New York, Vol. XXI, Book 1, pp. 167-68.

changes of petty politics, to forget the basic interests of the proletariat, the main features of the capitalist system as a whole and of capitalist evolution as a whole; to sacrifice these basic interests for the real or assumed advantages of the moment — such is the policy of revisionism.¹

Behaving thus, the revisionists always boast of their “wisdom” and “creativity” and trumpet forth their views as the “latest theories”. In fact, the “latest theories” of the modern revisionists are simply variations in modern conditions of the fallacies of Bernstein, Kautsky and other old-line revisionists and simply refurbished versions of the stock arguments which bourgeois reaction uses to fool the people.

Revisionism is opium to anaesthetize the people; it is beguiling music for the consolation of slaves. As a political grouping, revisionism constitutes a detachment of the bourgeoisie within the working-class movement, an important social prop for the bourgeoisie and for imperialism. As a trend of thought, revisionism will never fail to appear in varying guises at different times so long as capitalism and imperialism are in existence. In January 1917, when the Second International had become bankrupt in practice as well as in theory, Lenin made the prediction:

During these decades, . . . new Plekhanovs, new Scheidemanns, new sentimental conciliators like Kaut-

¹ V. I. Lenin, “Marxism and Revisionism”, *Selected Works*, in two volumes, Moscow, Vol. I, Part 1, p. 94.

sky will grow up from the depths of the "united" international Social-Democracy.¹

History has confirmed Lenin's foresight. In fact, shortly after Lenin's death a serious struggle between Marxist-Leninists and anti-Marxist-Leninists arose in the international communist movement. It was the struggle between, on the one hand, the Leninists headed by Stalin and, on the other hand, Trotsky, Bukharin and other "Left" adventurists and Right opportunists. In conjunction with that struggle there was the protracted struggle in the Chinese Communist Party which the Marxist-Leninists led by Comrade Mao Tse-tung waged against the "Left" adventurists and the Right opportunists. Now another serious struggle lies before us, the struggle of the Marxist-Leninists against the anti-Marxist-Leninists, i.e., the modern revisionists.

The Moscow Declaration of 1957 points out that "the main danger at present is revisionism", and that "the existence of bourgeois influence is an internal source of revisionism, while surrender to imperialist pressure is its external source". In the capitalist and imperialist countries, the general cause for the emergence of revisionism, which was analysed by Lenin, continues to exist today. Lenin said that "the comparatively peaceful and cultured existence of a stratum of privileged workers made them 'bourgeois', gave them crumbs from the profits of their own national capital, and isolated them from the sufferings, miseries and revolutionary sentiments of the ruined and impoverished masses".² This state of

¹ V. I. Lenin, "A Turn in World Politics", *Collected Works*, New York, 1942, Vol. XIX, p. 428.

² V. I. Lenin, "The Collapse of the Second International", *Selected Works*, New York, Vol. V, p. 204.

affairs is still in evidence today and is indeed more striking than ever.

The tactics used by the imperialists and the reactionaries in dealing with the masses of the people are dictated by their needs: sometimes they resort to outright violence, at other times they adopt certain measures of reform; sometimes they make use of crude threats, at other times they make seeming, petty concessions. These two kinds of methods are used either alternately or together in some intricate combination. Generally speaking, the more powerful the proletariat, the more cunning the policy usually adopted by the bourgeoisie in order to instil illusions in the working-class movement and evoke an opportunist response. Lenin said:

The zigzags of bourgeois tactics intensify revisionism within the labour movement and not infrequently exacerbate the differences within the labour movement to the pitch of a direct split.¹

His words should always serve as a warning to the international working-class movement.

Today the dark clouds of revisionism hang over the international working-class movement. The modern revisionists are openly engaged in splitting activities. The emergence of modern revisionism is, of course, a bad thing. But since its emergence was inevitable and since its existence is an objective reality, its public appearance enables people to see, discern and understand the harm it does. Thus the bad thing will be turned to good account. The modern revisionists appear to be jubilant because of the support they are receiving from imperial-

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Differences in the European Labour Movement", *Selected Works*, New York, Vol. XI, p. 742.

ism. But truth will eventually prevail over falsehood and Marxism-Leninism over modern revisionism. The modern revisionists may bluster for a time with their absurd announcements that Marxism-Leninism is "out of date". However, it is not modern revisionism, but Marxism-Leninism — which is in accord with the historical development of human society — that is certain ultimately to triumph and to grow. This has been proved by history.

The situation in which the international working-class movement finds itself today is much better than in the past. Now, there stands the mighty socialist camp with a total population of one thousand million. There exists the powerful world-wide army of Marxist-Leninists, and the people throughout the world are awakened as never before. There is the surging movement of national and democratic revolution. For imperialism, things are going from bad to worse. As for socialist revolution, to the rich experience gained in Europe and Asia has been added the highly important and brilliant experience of Latin America. These experiences have enriched the treasury of Marxism-Leninism, and are ideologically arming the revolutionary people of all countries. These experiences are diametrically opposed to modern revisionism. They are objective and historical reality, and all the attempts on the part of the modern revisionists to tamper with and twist these experiences are in vain.

The international ideological struggle between revolutionary Marxism and revisionism towards the end of the nineteenth century was the prelude to great revolutionary battles waged by the proletariat. Today's international ideological struggle against modern revisionism, waged under the great banner of Leninism, will

prove a symbol and a signal for the growth of the great proletarian revolutionary movement and all peoples' revolutionary movements on a still broader scale. Guided by Marxism-Leninism, the revolutionary movements of the people of various countries form an irresistible torrent. In 1913, Lenin concluded his article "The Historical Destiny of the Doctrine of Karl Marx" with the sentence, "... a still greater triumph awaits Marxism, as the doctrine of the proletariat, in the period of history that is now ensuing."¹ Similarly, today in our great new epoch of revolution—a great new epoch when the socialist countries have won one triumph after another in construction, when the liberation movements are rising in tempestuous waves in Asia, Africa and Latin America, and when a new spirit of awakening has emerged within the working class and among the oppressed people in Europe and America—it can be predicted that a still greater triumph awaits Leninism.

Guided by the great Leninist ideology, let us raise aloft the banner of the unity of the international communist movement, the banner of the unity of all the countries in the socialist camp, the banner of the great friendship and unity between China and the Soviet Union, the banner of the unity of the Communist and Workers' Parties of all countries, the banner of the unity of the people of all countries, and the revolutionary banner of the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement, in the common fight against imperialism and the reactionaries, in defence of world peace and for the progressive and righteous cause of the liberation of mankind!

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, in two volumes, Moscow, Vol. I, Part 1, p. 86.

